



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ĀRYAN WORDS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

BY W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, Bedford, Beds., England.

IV.

WE now come to Persian words in the Hebrew-Aramaic text which have—or seem at first sight to have—as their first element the prefixes *fra* and *ham*. Having dealt with these we shall be able to go on to consider certain other supposed Persian vocables which in reality are not such.

I. In *fra* (Avestic and Achaemenian = Greek *προ-*, Lat. *pro*, German *vor*, Eng. *fore*) there seems to occur only the word פִּרְתָּמִים in Dan. i. 3, 6; Esther i. 3; 6. 9. The B. D. B. Lexicon rightly regards this as the plural of the word which in Avestic is *fratema*, 'foremost', superlative of *fra*. As a noun it means 'chief', 'leader'. In Achaemenian the word is *fratama*, 'first': *fratamā martiyā*, 'leading men'. *Dahvyunām fratemō-dhātō* in Yasht X, 18 = 'prae-positus (prae-fectus) provinciarum'. The certainty of this derivation has recently been proved by the occurrence of the comparative of the same word *fra* in the Elephantine papyri. *Fratama* (*fratema*, Skt. *prathama*) is the superlative of *fra*, and its comparative in Avestic is *fratara*. In Sachau's *Drei aramäische Papyrus-Urkunden*, I, 5 occurs פִּרְתָּרַךְ, which would be *fratara-ka* in either dialect of Old Persian. The *-ka* is an adjectival termination (compare *prathama-ka*, 'foremost', in Sanskrit), not here a diminutive, and the word is rendered 'prefect'.

II. In *ham* (Avestic *hām*, &c.: Skt. *sam*, Gk. ξύν, σύν, Lat. *cum*, 'together with') we find three words, הָמָה, הַמְּנִיכָא, and אֶחְמַתָּא.

1. The first of these, הָמָה, occurs in the plural (Aram.) of Dan. 2. 5; 3. 29, and is rightly explained in B. D. B. as from the Persian word which in Mediaeval times was *handām* and is now *andām*. It now means 'the body', but it formerly meant also 'a limb'. But we can trace the word farther back. In the Avesta it is *hañdāma*, 'a limb'. It does not occur in the Achaemenian inscriptions as yet found. The word comes from *hām*, 'together', and *dā*, 'to put, make' (Skt. *sam* + *dhā*). It was taken into Syriac, as well as into Aramaic, and is there *haddāmā*, 'limb', *haddem*, 'to dismember'. In Arabic it comes to mean 'symmetry', 'stature' (*handām*). The assimilation of the *n* to the *d* in Syr. and Aram. is common enough in other words. In Modern Persian *andām zadan* or *andām andām kardan* (in Armenian *andam hōshel*) means 'to dismember', just as the equivalent phrase in Daniel does.

2. The word הַמְּנִיכָא, Dan. 5. 7, 16, 29, is variously read. The received text has הַמְּנִיכָא and הַמְּנִיכָא: Ginsburg gives also the K^etib form הַמְּנִיכָא. Andreas reads הַמְּנִיכָא. The Syriac word is *hamnīkā*, and the Targ. has מְנִיכָא. In the Talmud the forms הַמְּנִיכָא, מְנִיכָא, and מְנִיכָא occur. The latter word is borrowed from the Greek form *μανίκης*, used in Dan. by the LXX and Theodotion. *Μανίκης* is used by Polybius to denote the Celts' *torques*, 'armlet', 'necklet'. The meaning of the word in Dan. is evidently 'necklace', as has long been known: but what is its etymology? The B. D. B. Lexicon suggests that the word in its simple and indefinite form should be read *hamyānak*, and that it is a diminutive of the 'Persian *hāmyān*'. But *hamyān* is

merely the modern Persian pronunciation of the modern Arabic *himyān*, which is a genuine Arabic derivative of the Arabic verb *hama*, 'to fall', &c., and means (1) 'a loin-cloth', (2) 'a girdle', (3) 'a purse hanging from the girdle'. Arabic words taken into *modern* Persian do (very occasionally) take the Persian diminutive *-ak*. But we lack proof that Arabic vocables had won an entrance into *Old* Persian and there undergone such a change.

The derivation of *המני*, however, is really quite clear. In Avestic we have a word *maini* (=Skt. *maṇi*), 'an ornament', and specially 'a necklace'. In the Avesta a vulture 'with a golden collar' (*sarenu-maini*) is mentioned. Combining this with the prefix *ham*, 'together', we should have in Avestic *hammaini* (which in Achaemenian would be *ha(m)maṇi*). The *-ka* termination is usual enough, not always having a diminutive sense (see above). Hence the Achaemenian form of the word used in Daniel would be *ham(m)anika*, 'a collection of necklets', a 'neck-chain': probably therefore *המני* or *המני* in the Masoretic text is right.

The Targ. form *מני* is derived from the same word *maṇi* (*maini*), with the *-ka* but without the prefix. In Armenian the word *maneak*, 'a necklace', occurs, this being the natural form of the vocable in that tongue. From this came the Greek loan-word *μανιάκης* (also *μανιάκον*). The other forms in Greek, *μάννος*, *μάνος*, *μόννος*, are possibly loan-words from Persian, or possibly original, like the Latin *monile*. In any case they are from the same root as *maṇi*. In Avestic the forms *mina* and *minu*, 'necklace', also occur: hence the derivative verb *manel*, 'to twist, spin, weave', in Armenian.

3. The third word, *אחמרתא*, is the proper name of a city,

but none the less the same prefix *ham* enters into its composition. It has a prosthetic *h*, the *h* is an early error for *h*, and a final *h* is lost. All this is clear from comparing the different forms in which the name is found. The Peshittā has *Aḥmātān*, the LXX Ἀμαθά; Tiglath Pileser about 1100 B.C. writes it *Amadāna*, and the Talmud has *חמאדא*. This is, of course, the city of Hamadān in Persia. Dr. Driver and some others write it with the hard Arabic *h*, equivalent to the Heb. *h*. But I have never met it so written in Persian. (*Ḥamdān* with the *h* is the name of an Arabian tribe, the *Banī Ḥamdān*, having no connexion with *חמאדא*). Darius (*Besitūn Inscription*, II, 76-8) writes the name *Ha(ñ)gmatāna*. It comes from *ham*, 'together', the root *gam*, 'to go', and a termination denoting the place where anything is done: hence it means 'the place of holding a *hañgama* (modern *anjuman*) or assembly'. The form Ἀγβάρανα used by Herodotus is more correct than the more common Greek Ἑκβάρανα.

III. This is perhaps the best place to deal with two proper names of men, *Haman* and *Hammedatha*, though they have no connexion with the root *ham*.

1. *Haman*, חמאן, Esther 3. 1, &c. &c. The B. D. B. Lexicon says that the etymology is dubious, but on Jensen's authority suggests that the word is the name of the Elamite god *Humban* or *Humman*. Surely we should not accept such a most unlikely derivation until we are quite certain that no simple *Persian* source can be found from which the name can come. In this case, however, the explanation and derivation are quite evident. *Haman* is the Avestic word *humanō* (nom. sing.), from *hu* (=Skt. *su*, Gk. *εὖ*), 'well', and *man*, 'to think' (Achaemenian, Sanskrit, and Avestic alike), whence Lat. *mens*, Gk. *μένος*, Skt. *manas*, &c.

Hence *humanō* means 'well-disposed' (= Skt. *sumanas*, Gk. *εὐμενής*). As an appellation in its Greek form the word is fairly well known. In the Masoretic text only the vowels need be changed.

2. Haman's father's name was Hammedatha, המדתא Esther 3. 1, &c. The B. D. B. Lexicon suggests that this is from *māha*, 'a month' and *dāta*, 'given', i.e. 'Moon-given', and compares the forms *Maḏárης*, *Maḏárās*, *Maḏérης*. But it would be difficult to account for the first syllable in this way,—in fact impossible. The name is doubtless *Hōma-dāta* (which in Avestic would be *Haoma-dāta*, Skt. *Sōma-datta*), 'created by Haoma'. Haoma was the *yazata* of the *haoma*-plant, which corresponds in the form of its name to the Sanskrit *Sōma*-plant. *Sōma-datta* is a name which not unfrequently occurs in Sanskrit. With *Haoma-dāta* compare *Mithra-dāta* (*Μῆτραδάρης*), 'created by Mithra'. The *ao* in Avestic presupposes an *au* or *ō* in Achaemenian Persian, hence, doubtless, *Hōma-dāta* is the name we need: in the nom. *Hōma-dātō* would be a common form. That the *haoma* or its Genius should be thus honoured will not seem strange to students of the Avesta (compare the worship of the *Sōma* in Vedic times). Tradition says that Zoroaster (*Zarathuštra*) was born to reward his father Pourushāspa for making copious libations of *haoma*.

IV. We come now to deal with some words which are not really Persian, though they have been thought to belong to that language. Perhaps we should here remind our readers that loan-words in the Hebrew-Aramaic text of the Bible, if derived from Persian, *cannot* have come from the shortened and corrupted forms in use in the *modern* language, for these were not yet in existence at the time when the Biblical books were written. They must have

been derived from either Avestic or Achaemenian Persian. Hence it is unscientific to compare *modern* Persian words with them, unless we are sure that these have not been altered since ancient days. The modern word *Shāh*, 'a king', was in Achaemenian times *Khshāyathiya*: hence to suggest that any Biblical word comes from the form *Shāh* would be absurd, just as it would be to say that the Italian *selvatico* is taken from the French *sauvage*, or the Arabic *ḡamīṣ* from the French *chemise*, instead of from the Latin *silva* and *camisia* respectively.

1. Bearing this in mind, let us examine the proposed etymology of the word פֶּלַד (פִּלְדָּה) found in the plural (פִּלְדָּה) in Nahum 2. 4, *Heb.* It is now usually rendered 'steel'. The B. D. B. says its origin is dubious, but doubtfully gives Lagarde's suggestion that it comes from the Persian *pūlād* with that meaning. But this derivation is impossible for the simple reason that *pūlād* is a corruption of an older and longer form, and *did not exist* in its present shape when Nahum wrote. In Armenian, 'steel' is *poghopat*, *poghovat*. Now *gh* in Armenian represents an antique *l*; so we get the old forms *polopat* and *polovat*. From either of these, especially the latter, the Modern Persian *pūlād* is derived,—unless both languages take the word from an ancient Persian word. In the latter case, as Old Persian had no *l* (another reason against Lagarde's proposed etymology), the word would probably be *pōuru-pat* or *pōuru-vat*, the *a* being short or long. *Pōuru* in Avestic is *paru* in Achaemenian (Greek πολύ, Skt. *puru*, Germ. *voll*, our *full*): *pat* may be from the same root as the Sanskrit *paṭu*, 'sharp', or from the root *pat*, found in Avestic and Sanskrit with such meanings as 'to fall', 'to fly', &c. (cf. πετ-άωνται, *pet-ere*). *Vat* may be the Avestic root *vad*, *vadh* (Skt. *vadh*), 'to wound', 'to

hurt', whence Avestic *vadare*, 'weapon', 'blow'. 'Very sharp' or 'much smiting' might describe steel not amiss. However this may be, the fact that steel in Nahum's time was not called *pulād* in Persian, but *pōurupat*, *pōuruvat* (or, in Achaemenian, if we may similarly reconstruct the word, *parupat*, *paruvat*), shows that Nahum's פִּלָּדָה cannot come from *pulād*, whatever its etymology may be.

But is there any need for such a search? Is it not simpler to suppose that פִּלָּדָה is for either פִּרְדָּה (agreeing with אֵשׁ) or פִּרְדָּה, referring to הָרֶכֶב? In either case this amounts merely to the suggestion that Nahum substitutes ל for ר in a well-known Hebrew verb. (He indulges in several departures from the usual practice in vv. 4 and 5 in any case.) If with Wellhausen and Nowack we read כָּאֵשׁ for כָּאֵשׁ, we may render כָּאֵשׁ פִּלָּדָה הָרֶכֶב 'like fire flash the chariots', as the Russian version does. Or, reading פִּלָּדָה, we have, 'like flashing fire are the chariots'. In Assyrian the root פִּרָּד means 'to be bright', while *parādu* means 'to be impetuous, to hasten'. This seems better than to invent a word to mean 'steel', for which no proper etymology can be found.

The puzzle afforded by פִּלָּדָה is an ancient one. The LXX guessed that it meant 'reins' (ῥῆναι), and the Vulgate follows suit. The Peshittā conjectured that the word should be לִפְדָּה 'torches', but this occurs just below. The *Mēšūdōt Dāwīd* takes the same view. Rashi mentions this idea, but admits he does not know what פִּלָּדָה means. The Targum has בָּאֵשׁתָּא פִּילִי רַחֲבִיחוֹן זְמִינִין, which seems to mean, 'with fire are the elephants of their war-chariots prepared',—truly a remarkable idea!

It may be noted that, though רֶכֶב is usually masc. sing., yet Nahum makes the collective noun plural feminine by

his use of the *fem.* plur. pronominal suffix in ver. 5 (מְאִיָּהוּ), 'their appearance'. This justifies our suggestion that פִּלְרֵת should be punctuated פִּלְרֵת as a *fem.* plur. present Participle. It may be noticed that Luther's version completely agrees with this view, rendering 'Seine Wagen leuchten wie Feuer'. There is really no necessity, however, to change the Masoretic מִנְאִשׁ into מִנְאִשׁ, for the former suits the sense quite as well.

2. In Deut. 33. 2 occurs the strange word which in the Masoretic text is read מִנְאִשׁ, and which used to be rendered 'a fire of law', 'a fiery law'. This rendering took מִנְאִשׁ for the Old Persian *dāta*, which occurs in later books, but would hardly be expected in Deut. The B. D. B. Lexicon admits that this is erroneous, and gives various suggested corrections of the text, which we need not discuss. According to Ginsburg the *K^etib* has מִנְאִשׁ. We need not try to trace an Āryan etymology for the word, but it may not be out of place to investigate its meaning and derivation. There seem to be two possible derivations, each of which appears to give a not unsuitable sense. (1) Ancient Egyptian has the word 'ist, 'seat, throne, place', which comes from a Semitic root מִנְאִשׁ, whence in Arabic we have *isādah*, *asādah*, 'cushion'; *wisādah*, *wasādah*, 'cushion, pillow, couch, throne', and in the Targum in 1 Kings 10. 19, מִנְאִשׁ 'stays', 'arms' (of a throne) is used for the Heb. יָדָה. If derived from this root, מִנְאִשׁ in Deut. would mean 'seat, throne', and we should render, 'At His right hand there is a seat for them': cf. the Heb. מִנְאִשׁ 'foundation', in Assyrian *išdu*. (2) The other possible derivation is the root which in Aramaic is מִנְאִשׁ 'to pour out'. It occurs in Syriac, too, where *ešād dmā* means 'effusion of blood'. In Assyrian from this root comes *šadūtu* [Muss-

Arnolt, p. 1017], 'grace', 'favour'. If we accept this view we should render the text, 'At His right hand there is grace for them'.

In either case there seems to be no need of deeming the text corrupt and adopting conjectural emendations. The ancient versions and commentators render no real help. The Targum has 'The book of His right hand gave us instruction from the midst of the fire'. The LXX have ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. The Peshittā renders, 'And with Him from myriads of His saints at His right hand. He gave to them'. The Vulgate has 'a fiery law', and even Ibn Ezra and Rashi accept this now exploded rendering. The difficulty which many have thus found in the passage may perhaps excuse my venturing to deal with it here.